

**EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEMS FOR THE  
SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI FIRE DEPARTMENT**

**EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT**

BY: David Hall  
Springfield Fire Department  
Springfield, Missouri

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy  
As part of the Executive Fire Officer Program

January 2004

### Abstract

The Springfield Fire Department (SFD) uses its performance appraisal system for promotion, pay, and disciplinary action decisions. The problem is the current SFD PAS is ineffective in accurately measuring employee performance which means employees are being inaccurately rated for promotions, raises, and discipline. The purpose of this paper is to evaluate performance appraisal systems that will accurately measure employee performance and will meet the needs of the SFD. This paper uses an evaluative approach for the problem and seeks to answer the five following research questions:

1. What is the current SFD PAS?
2. What does the SFD want a PAS to accomplish?
3. What do SFD stakeholders desire in a PAS?
4. What are the types of PAS and the advantages/disadvantages of each?
5. What type of PAS should the SFD implement?

To determine the answers, interviews were conducted with key personnel, a questionnaire was distributed to the entire department, and a search of PAS methods was conducted. The results were analyzed to answer the five questions.

The study found that the SFD currently uses a combination trait and behavioral system with some essay components but primarily plotted against a graphic rating scale. The study also found that the department and stakeholder's requirements often overlapped particularly in objectivity, aligning the organization and the individual, and as a career development tool. The study also found a number of PAS each with its advantages and disadvantages. Once analyzed, no single PAS met all the requirements of the SFD. The two that most closely met them were a Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale (BARS) and Management by Objectives (MBO).

The department should implement a combination system utilizing both methods. Management positions should have a greater proportion of their appraisal based upon MBO and rank and file should have predominantly a BARS system.

## Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
Background and Significance	4
Literature Review	6
Procedures	11
Results	14
Discussion	28
Recommendations	30
References	32
Appendix A Interview-Assistant Chief of Operations	35
Appendix B Interview-Truck Captain	37
Appendix C Interview-Human Resources Coordinator	38
Appendix D Interview-Fire Chief	40
Appendix E Employee questionnaire	42
Appendix F Interview-Assistant City Attorney	43
Appendix G Fire fighter performance appraisal instrument	45
Appendix H Questionnaire response rates	47
Appendix I Supervisory questionnaire results	48
Appendix J Non-supervisory questionnaire results	49
Appendix K Analysis of appraisal types and methods to requirements and desires	50

## Introduction

The Springfield Fire Department (SFD) uses its performance appraisal system for promotion, pay, and disciplinary action decisions. The problem is the current Springfield Fire Department (SFD) performance appraisal system (PAS) is ineffective in accurately measuring employee performance which means employees are being inaccurately rated for promotions, raises, and discipline. The purpose of this paper is to evaluate performance appraisal systems that will accurately measure employee performance and will meet the needs of the SFD. This paper uses an evaluative approach for the problem and seeks to answer the five following research questions:

1. What is the current SFD PAS?
2. What does the SFD want a PAS to accomplish?
3. What do SFD stakeholders desire in a PAS?
4. What are the types of PAS and the advantages/disadvantages of each?
5. What type of PAS should the SFD implement?

## Background and Significance

Accurate performance appraisals are critical to both the department and the employee. Without an accurate evaluation, merit raises may be given with bad performance, or worse, be withheld with good performance. Employees may also be denied the opportunity to promote when their performance has actually been acceptable, or the department may promote individuals that have not performed to expectations in their current positions. Lastly, the job of a firefighter is not for everyone. The lack of an accurate performance appraisal may allow an employee to continue working with

unsatisfactory performance. Any of these situations can be detrimental to the employee and the department.

For the past 10 years, the department's PAS has remained relatively unchanged; however, according to Luthy (1998) outdated PAS are insufficient to motivate, encourage, or recognize employees. The current attitudes about the PAS are clear from a Campbell Organizational Survey, which was distributed to one-fourth of the Fire Captains within the SFD in June of 2003. When asked, "Our organization has good performance appraisal systems in place," none responded with "agree" or "strongly agree." The survey went on to ask, "Feedback on performance for people at my level is timely, accurate, and constructive." None of the respondents indicated they "agree" or "strongly agree" with the statement. Recently, the City lost two court cases involving employees in part because of the deficiency of the PAS. Without intervention into the process, exposure to future liabilities will certainly increase.

This Applied Research Project (ARP) will assist the department in developing an appropriate PAS that will meet the needs of the department and its stakeholders. It relates to chapter five, *Following and Leading*, in the National Fire Academy's (NFA) *Executive Development* course. More specifically, it relates to "performance evaluation and feedback" in the "cultivating effective followers" section of chapter five. It will also serve to meet three of the United States Fire Administration operational objectives. It will meet the objectives to "reduce the loss of fire in the age group 14 years old and below" and "reduce the loss of life from fire in the age group 65 years old and above" by helping ensure the performance of fire personnel on the fireground. It will also meet the objective

to "reduce the loss of life from fire of firefighters" by allowing supervisors to accurately evaluate employee weaknesses.

### Literature Review

A significant amount of literature exists on performance evaluations. Several themes emerged during the review. One consistent theme that is being studied is the purpose of performance appraisals. According to Alexon (2002), performance appraisals exist for five main reasons. "These are salary or pay decisions, promotional decisions, disciplinary action decisions, employee development decisions and layoff or reassignment decisions." She goes on to say, "It is not necessary for a fire department to have appraisals that serve all five purposes. Rather, the department must decide the purpose or purposes that will be served by having performance appraisals."

Aldakhilallah and Perente (2002) have similar reasons as Alexon indicated for performance appraisals but added others to the list. Aldakhilallah and Parente consider a PAS "to be essential and important in organizations and is used for several different purposes such as pay increases, improvement and training, transfers, compensation, counseling, promotion, employee recognition, termination, salary decisions and feedback."

According to Tompkins (as cited in Buchanan, 1997), performance appraisals have four primary purposes. A PAS may "direct and control employee behavior, distribute organizational rewards, improve work performance and develop employee capabilities". He suggests that a department may not necessarily need a system that incorporates all four purposes.

Ridgeway and Zucco (1987) presented another perspective for the purpose of a PAS. They state there are three purposes for a PAS. The first purpose is to validate the existence of the fire department. This allows for performance accountability to the elected officials and the taxpayers. The second purpose is to satisfy legal needs. Having a sound PAS, the organization can minimize its exposure to litigation. The last purpose is to motivate employees. Performance appraisals allow for a linkage between the individual firefighter's goals and those of the organization.

The debate in the literature over the purpose of performance appraisals is significant to this project. The PAS must have clear objectives it is to accomplish. Having various perspectives from these authors will allow a clearer understanding with the SFD as to the purpose of a new PAS.

Another theme that is under considerable discussion is whether performance appraisals are useful. The perspectives run the gamut. At one end of the spectrum, performance appraisals are considered essential to a successful organization (Aldakhilallah & Perente, 2002; Aurnhammer, 1996; Coolidge, 1998; Ridgeway & Zucco, 1987). These authors suggest that performance appraisals are imperative in meeting the goals of the organization efficiently.

At the other end of the spectrum are those that suggest abolishing performance appraisals (Deming, 1986; Fandray, 2001; Gray, 2002). These authors consider performance appraisals as a waste of time because they do not motivate, are biased, and are based on individuals rather than on team performance. Between the two extremes, others take the approach that a good appraisal system will benefit the organization but many have bad systems that ultimately hurt it (Linder, 1999; Shinkman, 2001; Smith,

2003). These authors believe that performance appraisals can improve morale, productivity and job satisfaction when delivered properly, but they hard to do fairly and take time to do properly.

The literature review for this theme will allow this paper to consider all possible approaches to performance appraisals. Although the SFD may indicate that a PAS is required, it may not. This area of the literature review will allow for a complete assessment of all possibilities, even including the abandonment of all appraisal systems.

A third theme that emerged was the method of the performance appraisal. Virtually all the literature agreed that a good performance appraisal takes time and is a process that should last the entire year (Alexon, 2002; Aurnhammer, 1996; Fandray, 2001; Linder, 1999; Losyk, 2002; Maroney, 1997). Each suggests that it is critical to provide employees feedback throughout the year so they can improve performance. Fandray takes this idea a step farther by stating, "Annual performance appraisals are falling out of favor with HR professionals. Instead, companies are turning to a process of ongoing assessment and feedback." This theme indicates the time commitment required to effectively provide appraisals and the need to ensure management will commit to it.

A fourth theme the literature covered was on constructing a successful appraisal. Fandray (2001) suggests six points to improve the effectiveness. First, is the need to link the performance-management calendar to the business calendar. Second, is to conduct a mid-year review. Third, is to articulate a set of role-based competencies. Fourth, is to set establish development guidelines for your employees, based on their roles in the organization. Fifth, is to not get bogged down in paperwork. And lastly is to focus on leadership by aligning your needs with those of the employee.



Alexon (2002) looked at the criteria for a successful appraisal from a different perspective. She considered the importance of having top management commitment and the need for all levels of the organization to be involved in its development. She also suggested that the HR department must support the purposes of the system. She indicated that the system must be fair and valid. Lastly, she indicated that the system must work for the organization by meeting its needs.

According to Ridgeway and Zuccor (1987), there are four criteria for performance appraisals to be successful. First, they must clearly specify the criteria for success. Second, they must provide an individualized objective standard for performance. Third, the individualized standards will relate to both team and organizational objectives. And lastly, the appraisal of personal accomplishments should provide insight into organizational training and development.

Luthy (1998) suggests seven components to an effective system. First, he suggests that core/job-specific attributes be measured to foster and maintain the desired culture. Second, a person's technical knowledge and skills should be evaluated. Third, interpersonal characteristics and skills should be assessed to look at an employee's ability to foster good working relationships. Fourth, is evaluating job-related goals and key objectives to align the employee with the organization. Fifth, is determining career management, personal and professional growth. Sixth, is both peer and customer reviews of the employee. And lastly, the employee-to-supervisor feedback to allow the employee input into the process.

The last theme in the literature review is the problem with bias. Losyk (2002) indicated that we are often unaware of our biases and that they may be positive as well as

negative. "A positive bias can cause you to rate the employee higher; this is known as the 'halo effect.' A great job at the beginning of a review period might mask mediocre performance for the rest of the period." Losyk goes on to say that you might give a higher rating to someone who always agrees with you or doesn't complain. Conversely, an evaluator might have a negative bias. This is known as the "horn effect". For example, an employee might make a mistake late in the review period and is then downgraded for the entire period.

According to Losyk (2002), another bias is known as the "blind spot". This is where deficiencies may go unnoticed when the employee has the same deficiencies as the evaluator. Managers may also downgrade employees that disagree with them often or who don't socialize with others. Lastly, Losyk suggests that managers may be biased against an employee when they complete a task differently.

Stipp (1999) offered five bias problems with performance appraisals. He suggested bias could take the form of the appraisal being overly positive, overly critical, uniformly neutral, single event evaluations, or most recent event evaluations. These differ slightly from Losyk's (2002) categories of bias. Overly positive is the tendency to rate everyone high while overly negative is the tendency to rate everyone low. Uniformly neutral is the tendency to rate everyone mediocre. Single event evaluations are where a single event during the rating period overshadows all other performance. Most recent event evaluations are caused by being rated on performance that occurred toward the end of the period rather than performance throughout (Stipp). Being aware of this theme will help guide the process in considering types of performance appraisals that can minimize evaluator bias.

## Procedures

In order to answer the research question, "What is the current SFD performance appraisal system?" interviews were conducted with the SFD including the Assistant Chief of Operations and a Truck Captain. The department's policy and procedure manual was reviewed and an interview was also held with the Human Resource department.

First, the Assistant Chief of Operations was interviewed to determine the procedures that management uses in the performance appraisal process. Questions one and two establish the background, while questions three, four and five help answer this question. A copy of the interview is included in Appendix A.

Second, a Truck Captain was interviewed to determine the procedures that front-line supervisors use in the performance appraisal process. Questions one, two and three establish the background, while questions four, five, six and seven help answer this question. A copy of the interview is included in Appendix B.

Third, a Human Resources Coordinator was interviewed to determine the procedures that the Human Resources department uses in the fire department's performance appraisal process. Questions one and two establish background, while questions three and four help answer this question. A copy of the interview is included in Appendix C.

Lastly, the Fire Department's policy and procedures manual was reviewed to determine if the process for fire department performance appraisals was outlined.

In order to answer the second research question, "What does the SFD want a performance appraisal system to accomplish?" an interview was conducted with the Fire Chief and the Assistant Chief of Operations. Questions one and two establish the

background for the Fire Chief, while questions three and four will help answer this question. A list of the questions is included in Appendix D. Question four from the interview with the Assistant Chief of Operations also answers this question.

In order to answer the third research question, "What do SFD stakeholders desire in a performance appraisal system?" a questionnaire was distributed to every member of the SFD. The same questionnaire was distributed to supervisory, non-supervisory. The questionnaire is included in Appendix E. Question six in the interview with the Fire Chief help answer this question. Question five and six in the interview with the Human Resource Coordinator help answer this question as well. An interview with the Assistant City Attorney was conducted to determine the legal requirements of a performance appraisal system for the fire department. Questions one and two establish a background for the City Attorney, while questions three, four, and five help answer this question. A copy of the interview is included in Appendix F. The Merit Rules and the Employee Handbook for the City of Springfield were reviewed to determine any requirements the City places on performance appraisals.

To answer the fourth research question, "What are the types of performance appraisal systems and the advantages/disadvantages of each?" the texts that are currently being utilized by the Southwest Missouri State University (SMSU) in the Public Administration department for the Master's level Public Personnel Management course; the text used by the SMSU Management Department for the undergraduate Organizational Behavior course; and the text used at Webster University for the Master's level Human Resource management course were reviewed.

The fifth research question was to answer what type of performance appraisal system the SFD should implement. The first step was to determine the criteria based upon results from research questions one, two and three. The second step was to establish the "required" criteria based upon the interviews with the Fire Chief, the Assistant Chief of Operations, the Human Resources Coordinator, the Assistant City Attorney, and the City's Merit Rules. The third step was to establish the "desired" criteria based upon the top five results from the supervisory questionnaire and the top five results from the non-supervisory questionnaire. The fourth step was to analyze the alternatives. First, each alternative was screened for the "required" criteria. Those that did not meet the "required" test were eliminated from further consideration. Next, each criteria was screened for the "desired" criteria. The last step in the process is the selection of the alternative the fit the most "desired" criteria.

#### Limitations

One limitation of this study was the questionnaire. The questionnaire did not explore every possible criterion that might be desired by the employees and supervisors. Also, there was no attempt made to determine the statistical significance of the questionnaire results; therefore, the results could not be interpreted to predict the desires of the entire population. The study was also limited in its search for every alternative describing the types of PAS available and other advantages/disadvantages to the systems identified.

#### Definition of Terms

Performance Appraisal - a process of communicating expectations, evaluating employee performance, and encouraging increased performance.

Evaluation - a performance appraisal

### Results

The answer to research question one, which was to describe the current system, comes from a variety of sources.

D.W. Whisler spells out the process in an interoffice memo (personal communications, May 7, 2003).

Step 1 - The evaluation form will be sent to the immediate supervisor at least 30 days before it is due. The supervisor will fill out the evaluation **within one week**.

Step 2 - The evaluation will be given to the next person who is required to sign it and make comments on it and they will complete it within **two working days**.

Step 3 - The evaluation will be given to the appropriate Asst. Chief for review and comments and completed in **two working days**.

Step 4 - The evaluation will then be given to the Chief of the Department for review and completed in **two working days**. It will then be returned to the immediate supervisor.

Step 5 - The evaluation will be reviewed by the supervisor with the employee and signed. Any changes to the evaluation at this point may result in review by supervisory personnel.

Step 6 - The evaluation must be returned to executive secretary Regina Wood **at least one week** before the due date for final processing.

K. Trogon elaborated on the process by explaining That he reviews the log book, reflects on personal observations, and discusses with the employee any certifications and classes that they have taken during the rating period (personal communications, December 31, 2003). K. Trogon also explained the process for training supervisors on completing appraisals. He indicated that he did not receive any training on how to complete the appraisal until he took the Citywide, Supervision II course. He noted that he did not get into the class for a period of time after being promoted and had completed nearly half of the evaluations that he has done to date.

S. M. Hoerning also indicated that the Fire Department did not have a training program on completing an performance appraisal other than the City program which covers evaluation processes in general (personal communication, August 20, 2003). He went on to say that this training is not mandatory for supervisors.

S. M. Hoerning also explained the specific appraisal tool currently being used. He indicated that each job position has its own performance appraisal instrument but that each is tied back to the job description. He indicated that the system uses both general traits and technical skills, which are rated on a scale of one to five. The system rates the employee performance against the job standard (personal communication, August 20, 2003). A copy of the fire fighter performance appraisal instrument is included in Appendix G.

According to S. M. Hoerning, employees are evaluated by their supervisor annually, from their date of hire until the employee is promoted, and then annually from the date of the last promotion (personal communication, August 20, 2003). He indicated

that the exception to this is when employees are on probation. If on probation, they are evaluated monthly.

S. M. Hoerning went on to explain that once the supervisor completes the evaluation, it is forwarded through the chain of command for review and comments. It is then sent to the supervisor for discussion with the employee. After which the employee signs the appraisal and forwards to the Human Resources department (personal communication, August 20, 2003).

According to B. A. Hall, once the performance appraisal is received from the fire department, it follows the following process:

When HR receives the performance appraisals, those that do not have a PA [personnel action] form attached are sent to the HR Specialist for the fire department. He reviews the appraisal and if it is complete and satisfactory, it is filed in the personnel file. If the appraisal is not satisfactory, it is forwarded to me for review and consideration. If there is a pay change associated with the evaluation, I review those evaluations as well to ensure that they are complete and satisfactory. I also review the attached PA form for accuracy and forward a copy of the PA to be entered into the payroll system. The evaluation and a copy of the PA form are filed in the personnel file. (personal communication, August 25, 2003)

The instrument that is currently being utilized is a numerically rated system from one to five. A rating of one indicates the individual significantly fails to meet the job standards while a three indicates they solidly met the standard. A five rating indicates they demonstrate outstanding performance with respect to the job standards (SFD, 1993).



The instrument uses both trait based and skill based criteria for evaluation and is a combination of subjective and objective measures (S. M. Hoerning, personal communication, August 20, 2003). The instrument also has sections to write in professional and educational achievements, areas in need of improvement and the schedule for those improvements. There is a separate instrument with job specific skills for each position, however the format for each is the same (S. M. Hoerning, personal communication, August 20, 2003).

The second research question designed to determine what the SFD administration wants in a PAS. From the Fire Department's perspective, the primary requirements for the system includes objectivity, that it measures past performance, it is tied to department priorities and the job description, it motivates employees, and the system cannot be overly cumbersome (D. W. Whisler, personal communications, August 18, 2003). D. W. Whisler would also like it to be a development tool for employees. The department also needs a method for each successive supervisor to note that they have reviewed and made comments as needed (S. M. Hoerning, personal communications, August 18, 2003).

Table 1

SFD Requirements and Desires

Needs	Requirement	Desire
Objectivity	X	
Measures past performance	X	

---

Tied to department priorities	X	
Tied to job description	X	
Motivates employees	X	
Not overly cumbersome	X	
Career development tool		X
Allows for review and comment	X	

---

D. W. Whisler also noted constraints for the system. First and foremost if the financial resources to develop a new system. The funds are limited, but the department is prepared to use the funds that are available if cost effective. The department desires to have a good system in place and is will to commit whatever training time is reasonably required to develop and implement a new system including supervisory training time and staff development time (personal communication, August 18, 2003).

The results of the third survey question which sought to answer what the stakeholders desired in a system was answered by a review of the City of Springfield Merit Rules and Employee Handbook, through interviews with the Human Resource Department, the Law Department and through two questionnaires: one to supervisory personnel and one to non-supervisory.

The process is required by the City of Springfield Merit Rules (2003), Rule 14.1 states, "The Director [Human Resources Director] shall, in cooperation with appointing

authorities and others, develop and adopt a system of appraising the performance of employees in the classified service for purposes of employee development and improving work performance." The Employee Handbook is more specific by stating that supervisors must complete a performance appraisal form for employees at least annually and they will become part of their permanent work history (City of Springfield, 1997). It continues by indicating its use, "They are used in awarding pay increases, determining layoffs and may be considered in promotional examinations."

For a new system to meet the needs of the Human Resources department, it will need to include current personal information for the employee, the type of rating, the rating period, the overall rating, any certifications and their expirations (B. A. Hall, personal communications, August 25, 2003).

The law department indicated that the system must meet certain legal requirements. These include that the evaluation criteria are closely tied to the important job duties and requirements and that the criteria be legally appropriate and nondiscriminatory. It must comply with the local merit system rules of fairness and rationality and that it does not intentionally discriminate against a protected class. The system must avoid creating a disparate impact on a protected class as well. Lastly, the system should not take into account other areas that are protected by federal law such as reserve status and pregnancy (C. Yendes, personal communication, January 9, 2004).

Although not required by the law department, a system should give employees indications about what they should do to improve in career development and enhance their promotability. This assists the employees desiring to promote and also assists the

City in defense against claims that their performance appraisals were satisfactory yet they are not getting promoted. Good documentation associated with the performance appraisal process is also important. It is recommended to reduce to writing any significant discussions held with the employee during the evaluation period. This becomes important should a disciplinary action become necessary (C. Yendes, personal communication, January 9, 2004).

Two other groups of stakeholders are the supervisors that must complete the performance appraisals and the non-supervisory employees that are receiving the assessment. There were 211 questionnaires distributed asking their desires in a system, the overall participation rate was 63%. Supervisory personnel had the greatest percentage of returns with 79% participating (see Appendix H for full results).

According to the results of the questionnaires that were distributed to Supervisors, they indicated that their top five desires in a performance appraisal system were (a) accurately measures employee performance, (b) consistency between supervisors, (c) neatly organized form, (d) measures year-round performance, (e) measures job description dimensions, and (f) measures all job dimensions. Six desires were given due to a tie for fifth place. Complete results are available in Appendix I.

The top five desires in a performance appraisal system by non-supervisory employees includes (a) accurately measures employee performance, (b) allows for employee input into the evaluation, (c) measures year-round performance, (d) a neatly organized form, and (e) sets goals for future performance. Complete results are available in Appendix J.

Table 2

## Stakeholder requirements and desires

---

Merit Rules	Employee development*
	Improving employee performance*
Employee Handbook	Held annually*
	Part of their permanent work history*
Supervisors	Consistency between supervisors
	Accurately measures performance
	Neatly organized form
	Measures year round performance
	Measures all job dimensions
Employees	Accurately measure performance
	Allows employee input
	Measures year-round performance
	Neatly organized
	Sets goals for future performance
Human Resources	Includes current personal information*
	Type of rating*
	Rating period*
	Overall rating*
	Certifications and expirations*
Law department	Tied to important job duties and requirements*
	Nondiscriminatory*

---

---

Meets Merit Rules\*

Career development tool

Good documentation

---

\*Denotes a requirement

The various stakeholders have many diverse desires. The Human Resources department needs up-to-date personal information, the overall rating, the period covered, and any certifications the employee possesses. Supervisors and non-supervisors want accuracy, measures year-round performance, and is neatly organized. Supervisors also want it to measure all job description dimensions while non-supervisory personnel want it to include employee input and to set goals for future performance.

Research question four requires the determination of the various types of performance appraisal systems available and the advantages/disadvantages of each. Heneman (1992) divided appraisal systems into two categories: absolute standards and relative comparisons. He then further divided the absolute standards into trait based, behavioral based, outcome based.

Heneman explains trait based as those methods that refer to a personality characteristic. The advantage to this type of system is its applicability to a broad range of jobs and it generated fairly quickly. The major disadvantage is the traits are often vague and subject to varying interpretation by different raters (Heneman, 1992).

Heneman states that behavior based methods refer to the manner in which employees carry out their activities or duties. Actual behaviors are then compared to the

desired behaviors. This method is less vague and more clearly defined than the trait based. It also provides a motivational aspect since employees know what to do to receive higher ratings and the behavior is under the control of the employee. The disadvantage of behavior based systems is more cumbersome, difficult, and time-consuming (Heneman, 1992).

According to Heneman (1992) results-oriented measures evaluate based on action products or services provided by an employee. Their advantage is they are highly specific and well defined. When set at challenging levels and accepted by employees, they also provide a motivational potential. Some disadvantages may include results that are outside the employee's control and they may fail to capture important components of employee performance.

Lastly, Heneman (1992) suggested relative comparisons as the other major classification of appraisal system. These systems compare employees to others on a relative basis rather than against an absolute standard. The advantages of relative comparisons are they can be quickly and easily constructed. It may also be easier for a rater to identify who is better and not necessarily by how much such as many absolute comparisons. The disadvantage of the system is the inconsistency between raters. It also may have little motivational value to employees. Lastly, in organizations with pervasive performance problems, the system may conceal many poorly performing individuals (Heneman, 1992).

Although Heneman chose to compare the performance appraisals based on their what was being rated, other texts tended to divide them based upon how they were being

rated. Those identified include essay, graphic rating scales, behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS), critical incidents, multiperson comparisons, management by objectives, and 360 degree feedback (Milkovich & Newman, 2002; Robbins & Coulter, 2002; Schermerhorn, 2004).

According to Robbins and Coulter (2002) a written essay exam as a performance technique where the evaluator writes out the employee's strengths and weaknesses, past performance, potential, and suggestions for improvement. Schermerhorn (2004) states that this technique is often used in combination with other performance appraisal methods, such as the graphic rating scale.

Robbins and Coulter (2002) explain the critical incidents method of appraisal as one that "focuses the evaluator's attention on those critical or key behaviors that separate effective from ineffective job performance. The appraiser writes down anecdotes that describe what the employee did that was especially effective or ineffective. The key here is that only specific behaviors, not vague personality traits, are cited." Schermerhorn (2004) suggests that the method involves maintaining a running log of effective and ineffective job behaviors. The written record of examples can then be specifically discussed with the individual.

Graphic rating scales are "one of the oldest and most popular performance appraisal methods. This method lists a set of performance factors...." (Robbins & Coulter, 2002). The evaluator then rates the employee on a scale for each factor. However, according to Schermerhorn, (2004) that although this method is quick and easy, its reliability and validity is questionable because the categories and scores are



subject to varying interpretations. Milkovich and Newman (2002) explain the problem with graphic rating scales. They explain, “Manager A and manager B could both have met their individual objectives, but we don’t know how difficult these....objectives were in comparison to each other. Without this knowledge, rating can’t be used to compare the achievements of two managers.”

The BARS method takes from both the graphic rating scale and the critical incidents method. The evaluator rates the employee according to the scale, but each item is an example of actual behavior rather than a generalization. This method has become increasingly popular (Robbins & Coulter, 2002). Milkovich and Newman (2002) explain that a BARS method will make evaluations less subjective because raters will have a common definition for each of the performance levels. They go on to note that both the BARS and graphic rating scale methods often calculate overall performance as a weighted average of all dimensions.

The multiperson comparison method is a system that measures the relative performance of the employee rather than against an absolute benchmark. There are several variations of the multiperson comparison. They including group order ranking, individual ranking, paired comparison, and alternate ranking. In the group order ranking the individual is placed in a general grouping such as the “top one-third” (Robbins & Coulter, 2002). This method was identified by Schermerhorn (2004) as a forced distribution method.

For the individual ranking method, it requires the evaluator to rank each person from highest to lowest while the paired comparison compares each individual to every

other individual and then gives an overall ranking (Milkovich & Newman; Robbins & Coulter, 2002; Schermerhorn, 2004).

Milkovich and Newman (2002) also identified the alternate ranking method. The alternate ranking method recognizes that supervisors are better at identifying extremely good and extremely poor performance. This system has the evaluator identify the best performer and then the worst. They then select the next best and the next worst. This continues until all employees are ranked. This allows the supervisor to improve their decision skills as they get closer to the middle performers.

With management by objectives (MBO), the employee and supervisor meet at the beginning of the evaluation period and establish goals and objectives. At the end of the period, performance is assessed by how well they accomplished the goals. This is the preferred method for evaluating managerial and professional employees (Robbins & Coulter, 2002). According to Milkovich and Newman (2002), in an MBO system, the objectives are identified from the strategic plan. They also indicate that there is generally positive improvements in performance both for individuals and the organization with MBO. They also note that this method requires more paperwork and increases both performance pressure and stress.

The last method of appraisal identified by Robbins and Coulter (2002) is 360degree feedback. This method gathers feedback from the employee's supervisors, subordinates, and co-workers. The information is then compiled to help determine the employee's performance. The text cautions that this form should not be used to determine pay, promotion, nor termination. Desimone, Werner, and Harris, (2002) suggest that the

process should include, “feedback from ‘key constituencies’ representing the full circle of viewpoints, subordinates, peers, supervisors, customers, and suppliers who may be internal or external to the organization, and self-ratings.” Desimone, Werner, and Harris, (2002) recommend that this method of performance appraisals should be used as one element of analysis.

The fifth research question was to answer what type of performance appraisal system the SFD should implement. The research found that none of performance appraisal types identified by Heneman (1992) in research question four met all of the requirements that were produced as a result of research questions two and three. However, two types met significantly more of the criteria than the other two (see appendix K for results). The behavioral based and the results based type of PAS each met all of the criteria except that the system should not be cumbersome.

When compared to the performance appraisal methods identified by Milkovich and Newman (2002), Robbins and Coulter (2002) and Schimmerhorn (2004) the research found that none of the systems met all of the requirements that were produced as a result of research questions two and three. However, four methods met a similar number of requirements. The critical incidents, graphic rating scale, BARS and the MBO each met all but one of the criteria. The critical incidents, BARS, and MBO were not listed as easy to use while the graphic rating scale did not meet the objectivity requirement (see Appendix K for results).

The six types and methods that met all but one requirement were then analyzed against whether they could meet the desired criteria listed in research questions two and

three (see Appendix K for results). The behavioral based, results based, BARS and MBO each can meet all of the desired criteria. The results based type of PAS listed in Heneman (1997) and the MBO listed in Robbins and Coulter (2002) are referring to the same system. The BARS system identified by Milkovich and Newman (2002) and Robbins and Coulter (2002) is a subcategory of the behavioral based systems identified by Heneman (1997).

This leaves two systems, BARS and MBO, which have met all but the requirement that it must not be overly cumbersome. They also can meet all of the desired criteria listed by the stakeholders.

### Discussion

Not surprisingly, many of the results found in this paper are supported by the literature. Tompkins (as cited in Buchanan, 1997) suggested that the purpose of a PAS is to develop employees and improve work performance. This coincides with both D. W. Whisler (personal communication, August 18, 2003) and the City of Springfield Merit Rules. Both indicate that the purpose of the performance appraisal is for employee development and to improve work performance.

One of the desires that C. Yendes (personal communication, January 9, 2004) cited was the need for good documentation, free of discrimination, and fairness in order to limit lawsuits. Ridgeway and Zucco (1997) who indicated that one of the primary purposes of a PAS is to limit liability echoed this.

Although there is much debate over the value of performance appraisals (Aldakhilallah & Perente, 2002; Coolidge, 1998; Deming, 1986; Fandray, 2001; Gray, 2002; Ridgeway & Zucco, 1997) the use of performance appraisals is mandated by the City Merit Rules and therefor must be established by each City department.

Another area of this research that was supported by the literature was the criteria for a successful performance appraisal system. Ridgeway and Zuccor (1987) and Luthy (1998) identified criteria for success: clearly specify criteria, provide objective standards, align employee with the organization and career development. Each of these criteria were addressed (D. W. Whisler, personal communication, August 18, 2003; C. Yendes, personal communication, January 9, 2004).

The implication of this study to the SFD is the foundation for the design of a new PAS that meets the requirements and desires of not only the department, but the stakeholders as well. Having identified the requirements and desires of stakeholders and the department as well as the types of systems and their advantages and disadvantages of each, the department is now able to begin the process of developing the specific performance criteria desired in the system. This process will also require the training of personnel in the use of the new system.

The BARS system meets an overriding theme that was identified by the department and by the supervisory and non-supervisory personnel: objectivity and measures actual performance. The MBO meets a different objective of the fire department, the aligning of the individual with the organization.

The only requirement that could not be met by the solution that it could not be overly cumbersome. The BARS system may be very cumbersome in its initial development (Robbins & Coulter, 2002), but some of that will fade once developed. The MBO will require a significant ongoing commitment. Additionally, virtually all of the literature reviewed agreed that a good performance appraisal system takes time (Alexon, 2002; Aurnhammer, 1996; Fandray, 2001; Linder, 1999; Losyk, 2002; Maroney, 1997). This would suggest that the department should understand that a good system takes a time commitment. In reality, there is probably agreement here as well but it was a matter of semantics.

### Recommendations

Although this paper has presented two equal solutions, the best solution may be a combination PAS as suggested by Heneman (1992). Realistically, a purely MBO system is not likely to be a feasible solution. However, it should be considered for the executive level positions within the department. The MBO system will align senior management with the overall goals of the department. A combination system should be implemented for the middle management and supervisory positions. The system should incorporate some MBO criteria to align these positions with the organizations. It should also incorporate some of the BARS criteria to help ease the time requirements. For the rank and file positions a BARS system may work best.

Further research is needed by the department in developing the specific criteria for the appraisal system. The department will need to develop a plan for implementation of a new system and the training on the use of the system. Once implemented, the

department will need to evaluate the effectiveness of the new system in order to refine the system further.

## References

- Aldakhilallah, K., & Parente, D. (2002). Redesigning a square peg: Total quality management performance appraisals. *Total Quality Management*, 13(1), 39-51.
- Alexon, D., (2002, January/February). Developing a performance appraisal program. *Minnesota Fire Chief*, 37-38.
- Aurnhammer, T. W., (1996, August). Personnel evaluations-Are we being effective?. *Fire Chief*, 102-106.
- City of Springfield, Missouri, (2003). *Merit Rules*.
- City of Springfield, Missouri, (1997). *Employee Handbook*.
- Coolidge, S. D., (1998, December 7). They're baaack.... *Christian Science Monitor*, 91(8), 15.
- Deming, W. E., (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Desimone, R. L., Werner, J. M., & Harris, D. M., (2002). *Human resource development* (3rd ed). New York: Harcourt.
- Fandray, D., (2001, May). The new thinking in performance appraisals. *Workforce*, 36-39.
- Gray, G., (2002, March/April). Performance appraisals don't work. *Industrial Management*, 15-17.



Heneman, R. L., (1992). *Merit Pay: Linking pay increases to performance ratings*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Linder, S., (1999, December). Writing evaluations. *Reporter*, 26(4), 31.

Losyk, B., (2002, April). How to conduct a performance appraisal. *Public Management*, 84(3), 8-11.

Luthy, J., (1998, March). New keys to employee performance and productivity. *Public Management*, 4-8.

Maroney, R. L., (1997, August). Performance tracking worksheet: A practical human resources program. *Responder*. 11-14.

Milkovich, G. T., Newman, J. M., (2002). *Compensation* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ridgeway, R. L., & Zucco, K. K., (1987, October). Assessing personnel performance. *Fire Chief*, 44-53.

Robbins, S. P., Coulter, M., (2002). *Management* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr. (2004). *Core concepts of management*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Shinkman, C. J., (2001, March/April). Performance appraisal. *AFP Exchange*, 21(2), 78-81.

Smith, M. H., (2003, January). Empower staff with praiseworthy appraisals. *Nursing Management*, 34(1), 16-18.

Stipp, W., (1999). *Employee performance evaluations, good or bad?*. Executive Fire Officer Research Paper, Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire Academy.

## Appendix A

### Interview Results Assistant Chief of Operations Steve Hoerning Springfield, MO Fire Department August 20, 2003

1. How long have you been with the SFD?  
**19 years**
  
2. What is your current position and what other positions have you held in the SFD?  
**Assistant Chief of Operations  
Battalion Chief  
Station Captain  
Truck Captain  
Rescue & Salvage Specialist  
Firefighter**
  
3. Describe the current appraisal instrument including:
  - a. Is the same instrument used for everyone?  
**No, each job description uses a different evaluation.**
  - b. What types of criteria are evaluated?  
**It uses a combination of general traits and technical skills.**
  - c. Are the criteria tied to the employee's job description?  
**Yes.**
  - d. Are the criteria tied to the department's strategic plan?  
**No.**
  - e. How is performance measured?  
**It is both objective and subjective. The system compares employee performance against the job standards.**
  
4. What is the current process for evaluating employees through performance appraisals including:
  - a. Are performance appraisals required by your organization?  
**Yes.**
  - b. If so, when are they required?  
**Annually, from the date of hire until the employee is promoted, then annually from the date of the last promotion.**
  - c. How often are they given?  
**Annually, except when an employee is on probation, then it is monthly.**
  - d. Who fill out the performance appraisal instrument?  
**The employee's immediate supervisor.**
  - e. Once filled out, what happens with the performance appraisal?  
**The evaluation is completed by the immediate supervisor and is then forwarded to his supervisor for review, comments and signature. This**

**continues until it reaches the Fire Chief who reviews, comments, signs and sends the evaluation back to the original supervisor to present and discuss with the employee.**

- f. How is the appraisal presented to the employee?  
**The form is discussed with the employee by the immediate supervisor.**
  - g. What happens to the appraisal after it is presented to the employee?  
**Once the employee signs it, it is forwarded to Human Resources for review and filing into the personnel file.**
5. How and when are evaluators trained so they can perform appraisals properly?  
**Within the Fire Department we do not have training on completing evaluations. The City provides supervision training which covers evaluations in general, but not ours specifically. However, this training is not mandatory for supervisors.**

## Appendix B

**Interview Questionnaire  
Truck Captain Kevin Trogdon  
Springfield, MO Fire Department  
December 31, 2003**

1. How long have you been with the SFD?  
**8 years**
2. What is your current position in the SFD?  
**Truck Captain**
3. How many performance appraisals have you completed?  
**I have completed 10 monthly performance appraisals for newly hired probationary employees and 4 semi-annual appraisals for newly promoted employees and 4 annual appraisals for regular employees.**
4. How/when were you trained on completing performance appraisals?  
**After I completed about half of the appraisals, I signed up for Supervision II, which is offered through the City's training division. It covered completing them.**
5. Describe the performance appraisal process that you go through after you are notified that an appraisal is due.  
**Once I receive the appraisal, I research the individual's performance. I do this by reviewing the log book, reflecting on personal observations, and discussing with the employee any certifications and classes they have taken during the period. I usually try to reflect on this for a shift or two. I then complete the appraisal form and again try to reflect on it for another shift or two. Next, I review the appraisal with the employee and discuss in depth the areas that scored high or low. I then forward to the Battalion Chief for processing.**
6. Describe what you do throughout the evaluation period and prior to receiving notification that a performance appraisal is due.  
**I ensure that I log any items into the log book on courses taken, special training and other activities that go beyond the requirements.**
7. How do you determine what rating to give the individual?  
**This is a hard one. After I do my research and reflection, I look closely at the description listed on the form. I then consider what I expect a fire fighter should do and then rate up or down based upon the performance**

## Appendix C

**Interview Questionnaire  
Human Resources Coordinator Beth Hall  
City of Springfield, MO  
August 25, 2003**

1. How long have you been with the City?  
**13.5 years**
2. What is your current position and what other positions have you held with the City?  
**Human Resources Coordinator over Employee Services Division  
Training and Development Coordinator**
3. What is the process when the HR department receives a performance appraisal from the fire department?  
**When HR receives the performance appraisals, those that do not have a PA (personnel action) form attached are sent to the HR Specialist for the fire department. He reviews the appraisal and if it is complete and satisfactory, it is filed in the personnel file. If the appraisal is not satisfactory, it is forwarded to me for review and consideration. If there is a pay change associated with the evaluation, I review those evaluations as well to ensure that they are complete and satisfactory. I also review the attached PA form for accuracy and forward a copy of the PA to be entered into the payroll system. The evaluation and a copy of the PA form are filed in the personnel file.**
4. What do you require in an appraisal system?  
**The merit rules require HR to maintain current information on every employee. This is accomplished through the performance appraisal. Every PAS in the City must include the following:  
Employee name, social security number, department, division, current step and grade and the job title. The employee must have a place to complete their home address, work and home phone number and whether it is listed or not, an emergency contact name and number. It must also indicate the type of evaluation it is, the period it covers, the overall rating for the period, all job-related licenses and certifications and their expiration dates, as well as a place for signatures of the employee and the supervisor and the date.**
5. What do you desire in an appraisal system?
6. Would your staff be available to train FD supervisors on a new appraisal system?  
**Yes, our training department is available to train the supervisors.**

7. If a local college or university would present a course on a new appraisal system, would it be eligible for the tuition reimbursement program?  
**No, tuition reimbursement is only available for non-required courses that are not specifically geared toward a department. This would fall under a department's budget.**

## Appendix D

**Interview Questionnaire  
Fire Chief Dan Whisler  
Springfield, MO Fire Department  
August 18, 2003**

1. How long have you been with the SFD?  
**25 years**
2. What is your current position and what other positions have you held in the SFD?  
**Fire Chief  
Assistant Chief of Operations  
Assistant Chief of Training  
Battalion Chief  
Fire Marshal  
Equipment Operator  
Rescue and Salvage Specialist  
Photographer  
Firefighter**
3. What will a new appraisal system be used for?  
**It will be used to evaluate the past 12 months of performance and identify strengths and weaknesses and allow the supervisor to identify how to the employee can make improvements.**
  - a. Evaluating past performance?  
**Yes**
  - b. Motivating future performance?  
**Yes**
  - c. Making promotional decisions?  
**Yes, to a certain extent. The merit rules require a satisfactory evaluation to be eligible for promotion. During the actual promotional process, the employee's personnel file is reviewed which includes the performance appraisals and that information is considered when making final selections.**
  - d. Making pay decisions?  
**Yes. The merit rules require a satisfactory evaluation to receive a step increase. The City also allows for merit pay for superior performance and the performance appraisal is an important part of this decision.**
  - e. Other?  
**I really like the concept of MBO especially for exempt employees. This would allow the department to tie specific current issues to our evaluations.**
4. What do you want a new performance appraisal system to accomplish?



**I really want a new system to be quantitative so it is not so subjective. I also want it to be able to be tied to the departmental priorities and the job descriptions.**

5. What resources are available for a new performance appraisal system?
  - a. Financial
 

**Funds for a new system are available, but are limited. The budget has discretionary funds that can be used if it is cost effective.**

    1. Development costs
    2. Printing costs
    3. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Supervisor Training Availability Methods
 

**I am committed to having a good appraisal system and we have not done a good job of training our evaluators in the past. I plan to commit to whatever training time it reasonably takes to ensure that we have a good system.**

    1. In-service, in district
    2. In-service, out-of-district
    3. Out-of-service, out-of-district
    4. Supervisory meetings
    5. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Supervisor Training Time
 

**Same as above.**

    1. None
    2. 1 hour or less
    3. 1-4 hours
    4. More than four hours
  - d. Staff Availability Time
    1. Development time
 

**I feel that we are able to devote the time required to develop the system.**
    2. Instructional time
 

**There will be a limited amount of time available through the department to instruct on the new system. We will probably need to consider other sources for training. I also believe that if someone outside the department presents the system, it will be better received.**
5. What do you desire in a performance appraisal system?
 

**I want a system that is a development tool for employees.**
6. What constraints do you place on a new appraisal system?
 

**A new system cannot be overly cumbersome and it must document the positive aspects of performance as well.**

### Appendix E

**Please rate the importance of each of the following criteria in a performance appraisal system.**

	<b>Very Low</b>					<b>Very High</b>	
Accurately measures employee performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Consistency between Supervisors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Measures job description dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uses non-subjective information	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Self-explanatory	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sets goals for future performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Allows for employee input into evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uses multiple evaluators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Measures year-round performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives feedback more than annually	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Evaluates a limited number of job dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Neatly organized form	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Requires little time to complete	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uses subjective information	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gives a complete picture of employee	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Measures all job dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Appendix F

Interview Results  
**Assistant City Attorney Carl Yendes**  
**City of Springfield, MO**  
**January 9, 2004**

1. How long have you been with the City?  
**13 years**
  
2. What is your current position and what other positions have you held with the City?  
**Assistant City Attorney, Law Department. Currently I handle legal issues and counsel for the Police, Fire, and Human Resources Departments, Police and Fire Pension Board, Personnel Board, and City Human Rights Commission. I also handle employment related issues for other departments, and sunshine law issues. I have also worked on legislative issues for the City involving law enforcement, fire, public sector labor, employment, and sunshine law. In the past, I have also handled work for Public Works and Building Development Services. I have also represented the Airport, and prosecuted municipal ordinance violations, mainly DWI cases.**
  
3. Are there any legal requirements for a performance appraisal system?  
**The main legal requirements for a performance appraisal system would be that its appraisal and evaluation criteria be closely tied to the important duties and requirements of the position, and that the criteria be legally appropriate and nondiscriminatory. In this respect, the criteria should be such that they comply with the local merit system rules as to fairness and rationality, and that they do not intentionally discriminate with respect to any protected class, such as race, age, gender, national origin, etc. This kind of issue is usually fairly easy to spot. However, even if the criteria appear facially neutral, they also should not result in a disparate impact upon a particular protected class. This is sometimes harder to anticipate, and there are defenses to such claims if the criteria claimed to cause the disparate impact are business necessities, but it should be avoided. In the discrimination area, however, taking into account some things which would seem to make good business sense can be illegal to consider because Congress has said so, such as military reserve status, pregnancy, etc.**
  
4. Does your department have any requirements for an appraisal system?  
**My experience is that the Law Department uses the City's standard annual performance appraisal form, and incorporate into our review the particular job duties of the position of the employee being reviewed.**

5. What do you desire, but not require in an appraisal system?

**In terms of desires but not requirements, my thought would be that the appraisals should also give some indication about what an employee should do to improve in career development. My litigation experience has shown that we could benefit from indicating to employees in the evaluation process what they could be doing to continue to improve and enhance their promotability. Not all employees are interested in career advancement, but for employees who are, have satisfactory evaluations in their current position, and then apply for promotion and get turned down with no reason why, both the employee and the city would benefit from some exploration of this. For employees who are happy in their current positions and are not interested in promoting, they could choose to ignore it, but the counseling would be there. From a legal standpoint, we also want to see good documentation. During the year, when there are problems noted, it can be good to reduce any discussions with the employee to writing. This is important when disciplinary action becomes necessary.**

## Appendix G

Springfield, Missouri Fire Department  
Employee Performance EvaluationAnnual ☐  
Probationary ☐  
Special ☐

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Position: **FIREFIGHTER**

Employee \_\_\_\_\_

Loc. Code \_\_\_\_\_

SS# \_\_\_\_\_ Current Grade \_\_\_\_\_ Step \_\_\_\_\_ Rating Only \_\_\_\_\_ Increment Due \_\_\_\_\_

**\*\*EMPLOYEES HIRED AFTER 01/01/1998 ARE REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN A CURRENT EMT LICENSE AND TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DEPARTMENT PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM.**

Check the following items in the appropriate boxes labeled 1 - 5.

1. Employee significantly fails to meet job standards.
2. Employee met some of job standards, but did not meet expectations.
3. Employee met job standards, solid performance.
4. Employee performance exceeded minimum job standards.
5. Employee demonstrated outstanding performance with respect to job standards.

A RATING OF 1 OR 5 SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED WITH AN EXPLANATION IN THE COMMENTS PORTION OF THIS FORM.

## General Traits:

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Attendance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Promptness in reporting to work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Appearance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Work Attitude					
A. During emergency operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. During non-emergency operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Toward public	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Toward co-workers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Communication					
A. Oral	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Written	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Ability to understand directions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Knowledge of department policies and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Compliance with sexual harassment and EEOC policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Loyalty to organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Performance in out-of-title positions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Fire prevention education efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Capacity to develop	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Ability to work well as a group member	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Technical Skills:

1. Knowledge of apparatus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Knowledge and locations of tools and equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Ability to use equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Uses proper care and safety while using equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Readily seeks new assignments and responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Able and willing to provide basic first aid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Performance during routine station duties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Adherence to safety policies and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Preparation for improved performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Quality of station tours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Professional Achievements:**

---

---

---

---

**Educational Achievements:**

---

---

---

**Areas In Need of Improvement:**

---

---

---

**Schedule for Making Needed Improvements:**

---

---

---

**Overall Employee Evaluation:**

---

---

---

---

\*\*\*\*\*

**For Training Use:**

Physical fitness evaluation completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Training Captain: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

Recommend Increment YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_

"My signature does not necessarily mean I agree with this evaluation. It does, however, signify review of the contents of this evaluation and the opportunity to discuss my questions with the evaluator."

**\*NOTE: All department comments to be copied or reviewed by employee.**

Employee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Battalion Chief: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Re-Routed: \_\_\_\_\_

Assistant Chief: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Re-Routed: \_\_\_\_\_

Fire Chief: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Re-Routed: \_\_\_\_\_

Director of Human Resources: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix H

Questionnaire Results			
Group	Distributed	Returned	Response rate
Non-supervisory	158	90	57%
Supervisory	53	42	79%
TOTAL	211	132	63%

## Appendix I

## Supervisory Personnel Performance Appraisal Desires

Criteria	Weighted	
	rating	Ranking
Accurately measures employee performance	5.76	1
Consistency between Supervisors	5.24	2
Neatly organized form	5.22	3
Measures year-round performance	5.20	4
Measures job description dimensions	5.17	5
Measures all job dimensions	5.17	6
Gives a complete picture of employee	5.10	7
Allows for employee input into evaluation	5.05	8
Self-explanatory	5.02	9
Uses non-subjective information	4.98	10
Sets goals for future performance	4.98	11
Gives feedback more than annually	4.43	12
Uses multiple evaluators	4.40	13
Requires little time to complete	4.05	14
Uses subjective information	4.02	15
Evaluates a limited number of job dimensions	3.75	16



## Appendix J

---

Non-Supervisory Personnel Performance Appraisal Desires

---

Criteria	Weighted	
	rating	Ranking
Accurately measures employee performance	5.47	1
Allows for employee input into evaluation	5.38	2
Measures year-round performance	5.23	3
Neatly organized form	5.13	4
Sets goals for future performance	5.04	5
Gives a complete picture of employee	5.04	6
Measures job description dimensions	5.00	7
Self-explanatory	5.00	8
Consistency between supervisors	4.98	9
Measures all job dimensions	4.90	10
Uses non-subjective information	4.61	11
Gives feedback more than annually	4.28	12
Uses multiple evaluators	4.25	13
Uses subjective information	4.20	14
Requires little time to complete	4.11	15
Evaluates a limited number of job dimensions	3.75	16

---

